

Original citation:

Fuchs, Anne. Robert Walser's Robber-Novel : an exercise in camp. In: Frederick, Samuel and Heffernan, Valerie, (eds.) A Companion to Robert Walser. Northwestern University Press. (In Press)

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/74193>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription. For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: publications@warwick.ac.uk

Anne Fuchs, Robert Walser's *Räuber-Roman*: An Exercise in Camp

Robert Walser wrote his last novel in 1925, one year after Thomas Mann's *Der Zauberberg* appeared, three years after the publication of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, and one year before Robert Musil announced his monumental *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften*. Kafka's *Der Proceß* and *Das Schloß* were posthumously published in 1926, and the last part of Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu -- Le Temps retrouvé* – appeared in 1927. Sandwiched between these epochal figures of high modernism, Walser looks like an oddity. While Mann, Proust, Musil and Joyce experimented with extreme modes of epic narration, Walser's domain was the miniature prose piece whose status was ephemeral and, in Walser's own view, without lasting value.¹ For example, in *Meine Bemühungen*, a piece from Walser's Berne phase, the narrating self mentions his dubious reputation as a "Kurzgeschichtenschreiber" (a stenographer of short stories) before qualifying his modest self-appraisal: after conceding that in all likelihood, the short story only induces short-term admiration, he then explains that he only became an author because his beautiful handwriting had been applauded by his school teachers.² According to the Walserian self, then, it was not his creative imagination but merely the craft of handwriting – in the age of mechanical reproduction an increasingly obsolete skill – that stimulated his writerly production. After this typically Walserian deflation of the very notion of creative authorship, the piece tracks Walser's pathway from his early novels *Geschwister Tanner* (1906), *Der Gehülfe* (1908), and *Jakob von Gunten* (1909) to the production of prose pieces for daily consumption and finally to the "Bleistiftgebiet," the domain of the pencil, of the microscripts:

Ich ging seinerzeit vom Bücherverfassen aufs Prosastückschreiben über, weil mich weitläufige Zusammenhänge sozusagen zu irritieren begonnen hatten. Meine Hand entwickelte sich zu einer Art Dienstverweigerin. Um sie zu begütigen, mutete ich ihr gern nur noch geringere Tüchtigkeitsbeweisablegungen zu, und siehe, mit derartiger Rücksichtnahme gewann ich sie mir allmählich wieder. (SW 20: 429)

Some time ago I switched from writing books to writing prose sketches because epic contexts had begun to irritate me, so to speak. My hand turned into a sort of conscientious objector. In order to appease it, I willingly demanded of it only smaller exercises in productivity – and thanks to such consideration I gradually appeased it.

Retrospectively, Walser chronicles here a poetics of reduction that began with the disavowal of epic coherence and ended with an extreme notion of smallness that made it a graphic feature of his textual production. From 1924 to 1933 Walser produced more than five hundred so-called microscripts, drafts of prose texts in pencil in a tiny hand of approximately 2 mm in height. Smallness does not, however, relate only to his tiny handwriting but also to his choice of writing material: he used a pencil on scraps of paper, invoices, receipts, envelopes and calendar pages.³ Walser's microscripts mark his withdrawal from the competitive world of the literary market into a space of private resistance where, without self-censorship, he could explore his insecure position in the literary market and in society at large.

The *Räuber-Roman* (Robber-novel) – a title assigned to the manuscript by the pioneering Walser-editor Jochen Greven – stands at the beginning of Walser's retreat into the domain of the pencil: together with the *Felix*-scenes the novel covers merely 34 pages of penciled script. Greven and Martin Jürgens, painstakingly deciphered this microscript and published a first version in 1972 that was then superseded by Bernhard Echte's and Werner Morlang's new transcription in 1986.⁴ A third edition will appear as part of the new critical-historical edition. While the belatedness of the publication and reception of *the Räuber-Roman* may, to a degree, explain why it has not yet been fêted as a masterpiece of twentieth-century literature, its marginal place in the international canon of modernism surely also comes from with its decentered and, as I argue below, "camp" mode of narration. The narrative enacts precisely the deterritorialization of literature that, according to Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, is the defining feature of minor literature.⁵ Writing within the context of a major literature, the writer of minor literature rejects the transcendental signification of major literature through a marginal or eccentric idiom that subverts conventional notions of coherence, power and of the sovereign subject. In line with this, Walser's *Räuber-Roman* consists of 35 discontinuous and

apparently rambling paragraphs that explode all conventional notions of a stable subject and of story telling. Martin Jürgens described the novel as “a piece of literary recklessness” because it confronts the reader with a disorientating perception and experience of reality.⁶ Samuel Frederick called it a work of “nearly unrelenting asides, a novel that sacrifices story in its onslaught of hesitations, prolepses, deliberations, non sequiturs, meta-commentary, retractions, contradictions, exhausting inattentiveness, apologies and a seemingly limitless supply of other dilatory tactics.”⁷ Peter Utz noted that the text entangles both the first-person narrator and the reader in a labyrinthine structure that circumvents all conventional notions of a sensible narrative world.⁸ Commenting on the relationship between the first-person narrator and his elusive protagonist, Christoph Bungartz remarked that both figures are lacking in precise contours.⁹

The ensuing chapter analyzes the narrator’s and Robber’s joint quest for enhanced financial capital and social standing through the co-authorship of a love story, the conventions of which they simultaneously evoke and thwart. By employing the commonplace narrative format of the romance, the narrator signals his willingness to fulfill the reader’s basic expectations. However, it soon becomes apparent that this promise is a mere ploy: while both the narrator and his protagonist seemingly conform to their prescribed literary and social roles, in reality they mobilize and exploit the reader’s desire for narrative and erotic suspense to very different effect. The verbosely digressive narrative mode not only negates linear, plot-based story telling but, in so doing, displaces narrative and erotic desire and the very notion of textual and sexual consummation. His exuberant loquaciousness and armory of rhetorical devices fuel narrative deferral, thereby forestalling the finality of signification. Walser’s narrator could thus be seen as a precursor or older relative of Beckett’s Winnie in *Happy Days*: in both cases the protagonists’ palaver asserts their presence against the threat of silence. While such plotless chattering is in both texts a matter of life and death, in Walser’s *Räuber-Roman* the frivolous and exuberant style is deliberately camp: it overturns the hetero-normative expectations that conventionally underpin romance. “Camp”, writes Susan Sontag, “is a vision of the world in terms of style -- but a particular kind of style. It is the love of the exaggerated, the ‘off,’ of things-being-what-they-are-

not.” And: “Camp is the consistently aesthetic experience of the world. It incarnates a victory of ‘style’ over ‘content,’ ‘aesthetics’ over ‘morality,’ of irony over tragedy.”¹⁰ In what follows I suggest that Walser’s camp mode of writing replaces hetero-normative desire with the playful performance of a mode of eroticism that throttles the engine of Oedipal conflict. We shall also see that the camp style is heightened by narrative *mise-en-abyme* that constantly collapses only to re-erect the difference between the narrator and his Robber.

II. From the first paragraph on Walser's deviant strategy plays with narrative mode, characterization, and emplotment.

Edith liebte ihn. Hiervon nachher mehr. Vielleicht hätte sie nie zu diesem Nichtsnutz, der kein Geld besitzt, Beziehungen anbahnen sollen. Es scheint, daß sie Abgeordnetinnen, wie sollen wir sagen, Kommissärinnen nach ihm aussendet. Er hat überall so seine Freundinnen, aber es ist nichts mit ihnen, und vor allen Dingen ist wieder nichts mit diesen sozusagen berühmten hundert Franken. Einst ließ er aus nichts als Nachgiebigkeit, aus Menschenfreundlichkeit hunderttausend Mark in den Händen anderer liegen. Wenn man ihn auslacht, so lacht er mit. Schon das allein könnte an ihm bedenklich erscheinen. Nicht einmal einen Freund hat er. Während ‘all dieser Zeit’, die er hier unter uns zubringt, ist es ihm zu seinem Vergnügen, nicht gelungen, sich unter der Herrenwelt Wertschätzungen zu Erlangen. Ist das nicht eine der größten Talentlosigkeiten, die man sich denken kann (R 11).

Edith loves him. More on this later. Perhaps she never should have initiated relations with this good-for-nothing who has no money. It appears she’s been sending him emissaries or – how shall we put it – ambassadors. He has ladyfriends everywhere, but nothing ever comes of them, and what nothing has come of this famous, as it were, hundred francs! Once out of sheer affability, benevolence, he left one hundred thousand marks in the hands of others. Laugh at him, and he’ll laugh as well. This alone might make a dubious impression. And not one friend to show for himself. In ‘all this time’ he’s spent here among us, he’s failed – which delights him – to gain the esteem of gentlemen.¹¹

While the opening sentence appears to set in train the romantic plotline, the narrator’s ensuing interjections suspend established genre conventions in favor of a

running meta-commentary that interweaves his own evaluations of his protagonist with society's overwhelmingly negative judgments. A string of negations dislodges the reader's basic expectation of characterization: rather than a descriptive introduction to his main protagonist, the narrator piles on the abuse. The Robber is denounced as a good-for-nothing, because he has no money, no best male buddy, and is bereft of all esteem in the world of gentlemen. To make things worse, he deviates from the norms of masculine virility because, as the narrator already hints, his relationships with women are entirely non-sexual.

Criminological theories of deviance tend to approach the concept from the perspective of a normative society that aims to limit behavior through control mechanisms, ranging from silent or explicit disapproval to official punishment. Deviance is thus a stigmatized form of difference that, in the modern age, mobilizes a slick Foucauldian machinery of surveillance, prosecution and punishment backed up over time by ever more refined diagnostic tools and sanctions. The institutionalization of deviance by the modern state de-individualizes the deviant other through a basic distinction between two types of deviance: the criminal and the pathological.¹² Revolutionary theory, by contrast, may legitimize deviance, but only if the deviant social actor is seen to serve an emancipatory political cause.¹³ In revolutionary discourse, deviance from the political mainstream is thus no longer criminal or pathological but is seen as a form of political resistance in the service of the common good. In Walser's novel, however, the Robber challenges this taxonomy of deviance because he neither engages in overtly criminal activity nor does he embody revolutionary practice. While he does indeed offend the code of acceptable conduct by, for example, shouting "Hoch der Kommunismus" (R 16; long live Communism!) in the midst of the good burghers of Berne, or, by throwing a cigarette butt in the gaping mouth of a man who is yawning in public (R 52), in reality he is persecuted because his deviance fails to conform to established definitions of a proper offence.¹⁴ Furthermore, it becomes quickly apparent that, in spite of the Robber's seemingly amorous pursuits, he is emasculated as he fails to convert erotic playfulness into heterosexual conquest. The public is therefore deeply upset by the Robber's refusal to adopt a fixed and recognizable identity. He is not only scolded for failure to conform to the bourgeois lifestyle but also for spectacularly frustrating the

expectations aroused by the supposedly reckless but manly “Abenteurernatur” (R 81; adventurer type). Halfway through the novel, a woman exclaims: “Ihrer Gestalt fehlt eine Etikette, Ihrem Lebenswandel eine Abstempelung” (R 81; your person lacks a label, your way of living shows no particular stamp; TR 72). The evident mismatch between the romantic ideal of the heroic outlaw and the Robber’s deviance is compounded by the following register of sins: the Robber loves eating semolina pudding (R 17); he engages in acts of “Löffeliliebkosung” (R 22; teaspoon fondling), a point to which I return later; he stuffs himself with the “Brotbröckeli” (R 34; scraps of bread) that his landlady left scattered on the dinner table and he gobbles up her half-eaten apples (R 34); he darns his own trousers, a habit which is deemed a “niewiedergutzumachender Verstoß” (R 50; an irreparable offence); he blows his nose with his bare fingers rather than with a handkerchief (R 44); he reads newspaper advertisements with indecent eagerness (R 45), and – above all – his marriage proposals are lacking in seriousness (R 44) .

At first it seems that the first-person narrator speaks for society in calling the Robber names¹⁵ and demonstrates his narrative authority by regularly dressing him down: “Wir aber schnauzen ihn für Verfehlungen stetsfort kalt an. Er befindet sich bei uns sozusagen in festen Händen, denn uns scheint, er habe es nötig” (R 28; we, however, shall go on coldly castigating him for his lapses. With us he is situated, so to speak, in firm hands, which he appears to require, TR, 18). In the attempt to distinguish himself from his inadequate protagonist he makes a point of introducing himself to the reader as a “vornehme(r) Autor,” (R 12; a refined author) who will disclose nothing unseemly – a servile act of self-ingratiation that is, however, immediately undermined by the ensuing concession that his narrative is likely to contain numerous “Unvornehmheiten” (R 8; crude episodes). Evidently, the narrator is unreliable: the incessant interruptions, exclamations and asides about the Robber’s multiple failings produce a theatrical rant quite out of keeping with the narrator’s supposed social conformity. In reality the Robber is the narrator’s accomplice who carefully collects his fellow citizens’ remarks (R 10), reports everything that passes between him and Edith, and even helps with the composition of the book until he is “ganz bleich vor Dichten” (R 133, ghostly pale from all his writing; TR 125). As Malcolm Pender has remarked, the split between narrator and

his Robber is a device “which permits the narrator to examine the interaction with society of some of his own attitudes, while he himself ostensibly retains views more in keeping with a writer who is conforming to his social role by writing a book.”¹⁶ Proclamations about a fundamental antithesis between the narrator and his protagonist are scattered throughout the text: the narrator reveals that he has to be careful not to confuse himself with the Robber: “Ich will doch keine Gemeinschaft mit einem Räuber haben” (R 71; after all, I wouldn’t want to make common cause with a robber, TR 62). “Er und ich sind jedenfalls zweierlei. Wir halten ihn für einen Löl, weil es ihm an Geld gebricht” (R 148-9; in any case, he and I are completely different. We think him a loser because of his lack of cash), and “Ich bin ich, und er ist er. Ich habe Geld und er hat keins” (R 149; I am I and he is he. I have money, and he has none).¹⁷ This split creates a Brechtian distancing effect that projects the writer’s social alienation on to the Robber; it also enables Walser to set in train *mise-en-abyme* to the point of convergence between the two figures. And so it is that both narrator and his Robber are under huge social and financial pressure to produce books of epic length for a demanding literary public, a point that deserves further analysis. For at the beginning of the novel the narrator had emphasized the Robber’s financial independence.

An inheritance from an uncle in Batavia, we are informed at the start, allows the Robber to lead an independent life:

und auf Grund dieser unalltäglichen und doch wieder alltäglichen Existenz baue ich hier ein besonnenes Buch auf, aus dem absolut nichts gelernt werden kann. Es gibt nämlich Leute, die aus Büchern Anhaltspunkte fürs Leben herausheben wollen. Für diese Sorte schreibe ich demnach zu meinem riesiggroßen Bedauern nicht. (R 14-15)

and on the basis of this extraordinary and yet also quite ordinary existence, I am constructing here a judicious book from which nothing at all can be learned. There are, to be sure, people, who wish to extract from books pointers for their lives. For this type I am therefore not writing to my gigantic regret.

The narrator's emphatic assertion that his book will not furnish the reader with lessons for life implicitly rejects the ancient notion that literature should provide profitable pleasure. Horace famously advised poets "aut prodesse ... aut delectare/ aut simul et iuconda et idonea dicere vitae" (either to benefit or to amuse, or to utter words at once both pleasing and helpful for life).¹⁸ On the one hand, the narrator's dismissal of the very idea of poetic profitability in Horace's sense aligns his writing with pure pleasure; on the other hand, however, he keeps returning to the burning issue of his diminishing material, social and cultural capital.¹⁹ Despite protestations to the contrary, neither the Robber nor the narrator are financially independent: we already know that the Robber is a good-for-nothing without money, and the narrator too confesses that he needs money and connections (R 15). This explains why the narrative is littered with references to money: the recurring motif of the 100 francs which is already introduced in the fifth sentence is therefore far more than one of the countless dead ends created by the narrator's digressive strategy.²⁰ As a persistent leitmotif, it reveals that the need to attain capital – monetary, social and cultural – fuels the engine driving the narrator's and Robber's joint efforts. Halfway through the story the narrator concedes that he needs to produce a book of some length to repair his damaged reputation:

Diese Umschweife, die ich da mache, haben den Zweck Zeit auszufüllen, denn ich muss von einem Buch von einigem Umfang kommen, da ich sonst noch tiefer verachtet werde, als ich bereits bin. Es kann unmöglich so weitergehen. Hiesige Lebeherren nennen mich einen Torebuben, weil mir keine Romane aus den Taschen herausfallen. (R 84)

These detours I am making serve the end of filling time, for I really must pull off a book of considerable length, otherwise I'll be even more deeply despised than I am now. Things can't possibly go on like this. Local men of the world call me a simpleton because novels don't tumble out of my pocket. (TR 75)

Rather than providing profitless pleasure, then, the narrator's digressions are prompted by the social and financial pressure to produce a book of some length, i.e. a material object that can be exchanged for enhanced social and cultural capital. In

sharp contrast to the earlier passage where he scoffed at the very notion of profitable literature, the production of a novel is rendered here as an act of economic and social productivity through which he hopes to overcome his deep sense of anguish and hurt about his own social degradation. But the Robber too needs to acquire monetary and social capital through writing: we learn that, on more than one occasion, members of the public have written to him, urging him not to stop performing the duties “seines so nützlichen Standes: ‘Wo sind Ihre einst so gesucht und so glänzend honoriert gewordenen Räubereien?’ hieß es” (R 30; of his so useful vocation: ‘Whatever has become of your once so sought-after and splendidly remunerated robberies?’ they asked; TR 20). What is at stake, then, is precisely the exchange of one form of capital for another through which, according to Bourdieu, social actors enhance their social status: literary works are a cultural currency that can be converted into monetary reward.²¹

And so it is that the narrator and Robber team up to co-author a love story that draws on popular literary models. In addition to exploiting the conventions of romance as embodied in the aforementioned penny dreadful, the narrative also draws on the figure of the loveable bandit as represented by Rinaldo Rinaldini:

Welch ein Unterschied besteht zwischen unserem Bürschchen und einem Rinaldini, der ja wohl seinerzeit Hunderten von guten Staatsbürgern den Kopf gespaltet hat, der Reichen den Reichtum abzapfte und solchen der Armut zugut kommen ließ. Muss das ein Idealist gewesen sein. (R 20)

What a difference there is between this lad of ours and a Rinaldini, who, of course, in his day, no doubt split open the heads of hundreds of good citizens, sapped the wealth from the wealthy and caused it to benefit the poor. What an idealist he must have been. (TR 10)

Paradoxically, the narrator's very denial that his Robber is a modern version of Rinaldo Rinaldini, the noble-minded protagonist of Christian August Vulpius' eponymous novel published in 1799, places his protagonist squarely in a popular literary tradition. Schiller's tragedy *Die Räuber* is another parodic intertext that recurs in Walser's oeuvre. For example, in the early sketch 'Berühmter Auftritt,'

Franz Moor is no longer driven by sibling hatred as in Schiller's text but is bogged down by *ennui* and the awareness that the plot of Schiller's play is rather clunky and forced. Walser's pre-occupation with Schiller as a literary model, prompting parodic repetition, continued well into his Berne years: 'Die Tragödie', a quirky summary of Schiller's *Die Räuber*, replaces the psychological depth of Schiller's characters with a comically allegorical rendition of their dominant character traits.²² Walser often generates parody by deflating the pathos of Schiller's tragedies in this way.²³ In line with this the Robber explains in the novel that writing consists of firing shots "auf unsere hochgeschätzten Modelle" (R 134; at our highly esteemed models). Although Walser's late novel contains no direct allusion to Schiller, this narrative too accentuates the Robber's parasitic literariness: we are told that he walks about in a robber's fancy-dress costume, wearing wide and pale blue trousers with a dagger in his belt, a sash wrapped around his hips and a threadbare, fur-edged coat. While his hat and hair embody "das Prinzip der Unerschrockenheit" (R 20; the principle of intrepidity), the pistol in his hand appears decorative: "Er glich dem Produkt eines Aquarellisten (R 20; He resembled the product of a watercolor painter, TR 10). This description is based on a watercolor by Walser's brother Karl, the famous stage designer who worked with Max Reinhardt at the Theater am Schifferbaudamm in Berlin. Entitled 'Nach der Natur,' it showed the 15-year-old Robert dressed up as a robber.²⁴ Such intermedial allusions make writing a form of theft that abandons authenticity in favor of a parasitic notion of originality. Accordingly, the Robber's only theft consists in the story lines that he snatches from trivial literature.²⁵

III. The novel exploits the genre conventions of a love story by ostensibly recounting the Robber's emotional conflict between love for a waitress called Edith and love for the teenager Wanda, whose name alludes to the heroine of Sacher-Masoch's *Venus im Pelz* (Venus in Fur, 1870).²⁶ In addition to this love triangle, the narrator peoples his story with a whole gallery of other female characters who – with the exception of the "Abgetane," a female outcast and the Robber's occasional companion – invariably represent the hetero-normative social order. For example, early on the so-called Henri-Rousseaufrau berates the Robber for his anti-social behavior, as evident in his self-sufficient ability to remain happy in spite of severe social censure. Towards

the end of her rant, the Henri-Rousseaufrau implores the robber in the “name of civilization” to believe that he was made for her: “Ich sehe dir an, daß du Ehemannstugenden hast” (R 18; I can see that you have husbandly virtues, TR 9). Social conformity through match-making is a narrative thread that runs through the text as a whole: when he takes up lodgings with a landlady called Stalder, she too attempts to coax him into marrying one or – as the narrator sarcastically comments – both of her daughters on the spot (R 56):

Hierauf würde der Räuber dann jeden frühen Morgen aus voller Leber ins Horn seiner Erledigtheit haben blasen können, und die eine Tochter Stalder oder bei zusammen hätten nichts als gemalt, gedichtet, gesungen, musiziert und gejubelt, und das wäre dann ein wahres Schweizerhöfli geworden (R, 68)

Then the Robber would have been able to blow each day at dawn with the sum of his strength into the horn of his own ruin, and the one Stalder daughter, or both of them together, would have done nothing but paint, write verses, sing, play instruments, dance and make merry, a real Swiss manor house (...) (TR 48).

The Robber escapes entrapment in a false Swiss idyll (the model is Gotthelf's *Uli der Knecht*), by co-authoring a romance that sidesteps the social enforcement of heterosexuality through marriage. With a sleight-of-hand the narrator and Robber filter such prevailing social expectations through the hackneyed literary format of the romantic penny dreadful, in order to then defer and ultimately circumvent sexual consummation by way of a disruptive stream of digressions. And so it is that the staged rivalry between Wanda and Edith who seemingly compete for the Robber is a narrative ploy that enables the team of co-authors to simultaneously mobilize and defer the reader's expectation of some sort of narrative climax. Time and again, *mise-en-abyme* saves the Robber from sexual surrender. The Robber's professed adoration of the schoolgirl Wanda evokes paedophilic eroticism: we are told that before she reached the age for long skirts he was “mit Haut und Knochen, mit Leib und Seele ‘unter’ Wanda” (R 53; skin and bone, body and soul ‘under’ Wanda, TR, 44). However, this overtone gains a burlesque dimension when, with characteristic

hyperbole, the Robber is prepared to throw himself into the Tower of Hunger from Dante's *Inferno* because Wanda is "der lieblichste Kitsch auf der Erde" (R 53; the sweetest bit of kitsch on the planet, TR 44). This comical chain of association accentuates the Robber's camp role-play: by exposing Wanda as literary kitsch, the Robber turns eroticism into camp style. As a pastiche of various clichés that range from the innocent schoolgirl, the unreachable Empress of Russia to the titillating dominatrix, the figure of Wanda allows the Robber to perform romance as role-play without heterosexual desire. However, in Walser's *Räuber-Roman*, *mise-en-abyme* works both ways: it not only exposes Wanda's made-up-ness but it also allows for Wanda's transformation back into a plump character with far too chubby lips whom the Robber then dumps (R, 55).

After abandoning Wanda, the Robber moves on to Edith, who will also be caught up in such narrative loops. Towards the end of the novel, the Robber informs Edith's protector, an unnamed figure who is described as a mediocre but otherwise perfectly solid individual (R 134), that Edith is the main character in a smallish but meaning-packed novel that he is currently writing (R 134). Originally, he had planned to compose this novel under the eyes of his beloved in the public house where Edith worked as a waitress, but his romantic resolve came to nothing (R 39). His failure to produce a romance in Edith's presence thus brings to the fore the logic of erotic deferral which feeds on fantasy and distance. And so it is that the Robber considers it indispensable "so um seine Edith herum, an die er nicht herankam oder vielleicht aus sich heraus gar nicht herankommen wollte, Schwärmereien zu haben, gleichsam Nebenschönheiten (R 69, to entertain besides Edith, to whom he could not get close or perhaps never really wanted to get close, infatuations, secondary queens, as it were). Such calculated displacement of desire allows the Robber to both publicly perform the role of romantic lover and to fuel the engine of the literary romance with erotic deferral.

It comes as no surprise then that, towards the end, the Robber confesses publicly that he has already received an honorarium for all the stories about Edith that he has made up (R 181). Edith's earlier misgivings that the robber is colluding with a known author in the writing of a love story about her are thus entirely justified:

Und nun ist er zu einem anerkannten Autor gegangen, hat diesem alles berichtet, und jetzt dichten und schreiben sie mit vereinten Anstrengungen über mich, und ich kann mich nicht wehren, und niemand setzt sich für mich ein. Ich muß mir die Dichtereien dieses Bettlers gefallen lassen, der nicht einmal hundert Franken aus dem Portemonnaie hat fallen und hinausgleiten lassen. (R 134-35)

And now he's gone to a respected author and told him everything, and now the two of them are composing and writing about me with combined efforts and I am powerless to defend myself and there's no one to stand up for me. I have to put up with the scribblings of this beggar who wouldn't even let a hundred francs come tumbling and sliding out of his wallet. (TR 126)

The female protagonist emerges as the real victim of the Robber's and narrator's joint plot to exploit Edith's erotic appeal. By co-authoring a love story about her, they conspire to convert pleasure into material and social capital. As a writer the Robber is a thieving rascal in more than one sense: he not only steals his story lines from the trivial literature that he regularly consumes, but he leaves Edith empty-handed by converting her promised payment into a fictional currency. The narrator declares rather triumphantly that the 100 francs were purely literary in nature: "Er erzählte nämlich einmal in einem Manuskript er habe einer Saaltochter hundert Franken ins Händchen gedrückt, und nun warteten alle Saaltöchter dieser Stadt auf Aushändigung dieses poetischen Geldes" (R 65; For he once, in manuscript, described having placed one hundred francs in the little hands of a waitress, and now every barmaid in the city was awaiting delivery of this poetic sum; TR 55). Evidently, Walser's clever play with *mise-en-abyme* not only swallows up Edith's payment but the prospect of any financial profit.

The comical performance of such hackneyed romances allows the team of narrator and Robber to co-produce precisely a book of "some length" with which they want to regain lost social and financial ground. But the narrative also features instances of the Robber's genuine erotic pleasure. Of central importance in this regard is the episode in which the Robber licks his landlady's used teaspoon:

Neben dem Schüttstein ruhte und träumte in seiner Tasse das Löffeli, das die Witwe zum Kaffeetrinken benutzt hatte. 'Das Löffeli ist von ihr zum Mund hineingesteckt worden. Ihr Mund ist bildhübsch. Das übrige an ihr ist hundertmal weniger hübsch als gerade ihr Mund, und ich sollte zaudern können, dieses Hübsche, das sie an sich hat, dadurch hochzuschätzen, daß ich jetzt dieses Löffeli gleichsam küsse? Solchergestalt lauteten seine literarischen Ausführungen. Er sprach da gleichsam einen geistvollen Essay und hatte natürlich seine Freude daran. (...) Einen Freudensprung mindestens wird er wohl ausgeführt haben nach seiner Löffeliliebkosung. (R 22)

Beside the sink and dreaming in its cup, the spoon reposed which the widow had used when she drank her coffee. 'This little spoon has been placed by her in her mouth. Her mouth is as pretty as a picture. Everything else about her is a hundred times less lovely than her mouth, so how could I possibly hesitate to pay homage to this prettiness by kissing, as it were, this little spoon?' Such were his literary observations. He was giving voice, so to speak, to an insightful essay, which, of course, gave him delight. (...) We can assume he executed at least one leap of joy following his tea spoon fondle. (Translation by AF)

At first sight the episode appears as a classic case of a fetishistic performance through which the Robber would enact the disavowal of his castration anxiety. This line of interpretation appears to be suggested by the narrator himself who calls the Robber's licking of the tea spoon "a stattliche Leistung auf erotischem Gebiet" (R 22; an impressive feat in the field of eroticism, TR 12), thus outing his protagonist as a kinky fetishist who depends on substitutes for his sexual kicks. According to Freud, the male child's shocking discovery that women don't have a penis leads to castration anxiety which then unleashes a conflict between this troubling discovery and the disavowal that this can be true. By substituting the lacking female organ, the fetish offers a compromise: it erects a permanent memorial to this traumatic discovery, simultaneously providing protection against the threat of castration while also giving expression to the triumph over it.²⁷ Fetishism is thus characterized by the irresolvable ambivalence between the acceptance that castration has taken place and its disavowal. According to Freud, stockings, shoes, underwear and bits of fur are often the preferred objects of the fetishist's desire. But is the "Löffeliliebkosung"

really an example of fetishism in Freudian terms? And is the “Löffeli” a suitable fetish?

Arguably, the point of the above episode is not so much the Freudian enactment of Oedipal castration anxiety but rather the disavowal of the phallus as prime signifier of the symbolic order. Rather than substituting the phallus, his landlady's used teaspoon evokes the oral pleasure of feeding that precedes any Oedipal desire. At the heart of the episode is thus a polymorphous eroticism that psychoanalysis would designate regressive. As a performance at the kitchen sink, i.e. the location where mothers and women tend to clean up, the “Löffeliliebkosung” upstages Freud's script which, in misogynistic fashion, revolves around the dramatic discovery of a lack in women. In contrast to the Freudian fetishist, who is driven by castration anxiety, the Robber also indulges in gender jumping and camp cross-dressing: whenever he wears an apron, he is thrilled by his transformation into a maid and his effeminate looks (R 108). Evidently, the Robber inhabits a pre-Oedipal sphere of pleasure that is unaroused by the economy of heterosexual love.

The Robber's absence of heterosexual response is also conveyed through the leitmotif of a pre-Oedipal childlike quality which, as the narrator speculates, might be another reason for his persecution (R 51). In Walser's oeuvre, the motif of 'Kindlichkeit' (childlikeness) designates an energetic spontaneity and unruly buoyancy that are as yet unharnessed by the rules of the symbolic order. It stands for the exhilarating creativity and élan that Walser associates with a new language of love that has the potential to disrupt the phallic economy of human sexuality. However, when an Englishman claims that lack of sex can cause long-term problems, above all “eine Art von Vertrottelung” (R 66; a sort of mental degeneration), the Robber and his narrator do get worried. Eventually the narrator dispatches the Robber to consult a doctor, to whom he confesses that he has never felt any sexual aggression or lust (R 112). He explains that a sort of child resides in him and that he often feels like a girl who loves her household duties, declaring that the question of whether or not he might be a girl has never troubled him or made him unhappy (R, 112). Even though he has never felt the urge to spend a night with a woman (R 113), the Robber's “Fond an Liebeskraft” (R 114, a reservoir of love) is immense. He further reveals that he can only engage in romance by making up stories in which he

plays the part of the “unterliegende, gehorchende, opfernde, bewachte, bevormundete Teil” (R 115; the subordinate, obedient, sacrificing, scrutinized, and chaperoned party, TR 106). At first sight this therapeutic confession appears to corroborate the Freudian notion of masochism, according to which it is the male child’s pathological response to the Oedipal threat by the father. For Freud Oedipal castration anxiety turns into masochistic perversion if this fear translates into a passive sexual role.²⁸ In a later essay Freud linked feminine masochism in men explicitly to infantilism: sexual infantilism and femininity are deemed to be pathological and perverse precisely because they are characterized by passivity.²⁹ Although Freud mentions in passing the idea of a playful performance of feminine masochism,³⁰ for him this phenomenon is determined by the presence of sadistic impulses in the masochist. By contrast, Gilles Deleuze returned to the literary sources of sado-masochism, the works of Marquis de Sade and Sacher-Masoch, to explore masochism’s dramaturgical and staged dimension. Freud’s passing acknowledgement of playful masochism is for Deleuze a quintessential dimension that imposes a formal structure onto the masochistic scenario.³¹ As Thamen and Wallenberg argue, “masochism’s formality is inscribed explicitly in the contract governing masochist relations between two partners. This contract invests masochism with strict rules, roles and directions. The contract is a narrative in itself already replete with a scenario, a story and *dramatis personae*.”³² In line with the scripted dimension of masochism, the Robber’s meta-consciousness calls attention to the theatrical performance of playful masochism. He knows all too well that his erotic thrills derive from dramatic suspense rather than from real humiliation. At the end of the consultation with the doctor, the latter therefore gives him the following advice in defiance of psychoanalytic orthodoxy: “Lassen Sie sich so, wie Sie sind, leben Sie so weiter, wie Sie bisher gelebt haben. Sie kennen sich ja anscheinend ausgezeichnet, finden sich ausgezeichnet mit sich ab” (R 115; remain as you are, go on living the way you live. You seem to know yourself, and to have come to terms with yourself, exceedingly well; TR 106).

Rather than a clinical symptom, the “Löffeliliebkosung”, then, is a central episode that liberates pleasure from sexual consummation. While for Freud fetishism merely serves to underline the status of the phallus in the symbolic order,

here we are dealing with a pre-Oedipal form of eroticism and a camp transmuting of the Robber's oral pleasure at the kitchen sink into the reader's aural delight. With its alliterations and Swiss diminutive, the prime signifier of the "Löffeliliebkosung" is therefore not the phallus but the idea of a language of poetry that generates pleasure. The conversion of the Robber's pre-Oedipal eroticism into literary pleasure is already alluded to in the scene quoted above: his erotically charged thoughts about his landlady's used teaspoon are, after all, "literarische Ausführungen" (literary observations), framed by "ein beständiges Poesiezwielficht" (R 22, enduring poetic twilight). And when, later on, the Robber confesses his transgression to his landlady, his disclosure is neither motivated by a sense of guilt nor by his exhibitionistic tendencies but rather by a discussion about Joan of Arc, the 'Jungfrau von Orleans', i.e. another literary figure that associated with Schiller. Accordingly, the real purpose of the confession is the enactment of literary roles. It thus comes as no surprise that, in the eyes of the Robber, the landlady leaves the stage like a queen: "Man kann sagen, daß sie wie ein Bild ausgesehen habe. Sie hatte da so etwas Kuperstichhaftes, wie sie so den Korridor entlang ging, indigniert und sicher nicht ganz ungeschmeichelt" (R 35; One might say she looked exactly like a picture. There was something about her reminiscent of an etching., the way she retreated down the corridor, offended, yet also, surely, just a little bit pleased; TR 25).

IV. We have seen that throughout the narrative the co-authoring team of narrator and Robber exploit extremely hackneyed notions of social and literary popularity – the romantic lover and the heroic robber who fights on behalf of the poor – to boost their own reputation. Much debate in Walser criticism therefore concerns the perceived conflict between the subject's autonomy and subjugation in Walser's late novel. One school of thought holds that precisely because the Robber is the narrator's accomplice, he is entrapped by genre conventions. For Ernst Osterkamp the delivery of the novel enacts a social custodianship that controls and ultimately stifles the Robber's rebellious subjectivity.³³ By contrast Peter Utz argues that the labyrinthine structure of this narrative defies such a simple surrender to the formal intention of writing a novel.³⁴ That the digressive style of this narrative does indeed offer an escape route from the prison house of genre and form, can be gleaned from

the narrator's observation towards the end: "Das Ganze kommt mir übrigens vor wie eine große, große Glosse, lächerlich und abgründig" (R 148; the whole thing seems to me, by the way, like a big prose sketch, ridiculous and unfathomable). With this final transmutation of the epic form of the novel into a mere "Glosse", or short note on something else, the narrator calls attention to his decentered, camp mode of writing that formally replicates the Robber's mode of social deviance.

The narrator's apparent downgrading of his novel is much more than a throwaway remark. Its poetological significance finds full articulation in Walser's text 'Die Glosse' in which he foregrounds and stages with typical hyperbolic humor the diminution and marginalization of his writing in a harsh literary market. At the beginning of this text the author is depicted as a mere 'Glossenschmied', a toiling blacksmith of notes, whose exhausted 'Skizzenhervorbringerseele' (sketch-producing soul) has to contend with a contemptuous literary public. While the grand form of the novel aims to achieve a totality of historical representation, the transient form of the "Glosse" is deemed a "Verkommenheit" (a degenerate form) that bogs him down in the quagmire of literary deviance. However, the narrating self then overturns this negative judgment through an increasingly burlesque meta-consciousness that stages marginality as a creative vantage point: placing his finger on his "geistvolle Nase" (his thoughtful nose), he realizes that it is not so much epic form and polished style that matter but the intention of "irgend etwas Lesenswertes, Aufheiterndes segelschiffwimpelnd ins liebe Publikumsmeer hinauszusenden" (floating something that is well worth reading and entertaining like the bunting of a sailing boat out into the sea of the lovely public; GS 19: 287). Surrounded by the "Engel der Prosapoesie" (angels of poetry in prose), the self then recognizes that his small texts have the power to resonate with the public precisely because of his ability to explode literary conventions (GS 19: 288).

The *Räuber*-Roman concludes with the narrator recommending the Robber to a discerning minority:

und so unlogisch das auch scheint, bin ich des Glaubens und erkläre mich mit all denjenigen einverstanden, die meinen, es sei schicklich, daß man den Räuber angenehm finde und daß man ihn von nun an kenne und grüße. (R 150)

and, illogical, as it may seem, I hold the belief and concur with all those who maintain that it is only proper that the Robber be found agreeable and that from now on he be recognized and greeted. (TR 141)

However, the convoluted mannerism of this final gesture makes the envisaged mutual assent an extremely fragile construct. To be sure: by inviting the public to greet his protagonist, the narrator seeks to procure the Robber's social rehabilitation. On the other hand, the mannerist sentence structure pushes the realization of the desired approval from the social sphere into the realm of the literary work. In the final analysis Walser envisages rehabilitation as a form of literary partisanship that can only be enacted through the reader's pleasure in a camp mode of narration. Rather than a mere strategy to produce a lengthy novel, the narrator's digressions and his loquaciousness enact an infectious playfulness that relishes precisely the "theatricalization of experience" that for Sontag marks camp style.³⁵ In so doing the text envisages a community between narrator, protagonist and reader that dethrones heteronormative designations, roles and expectations. As Sontag notes, "camp is a solvent of morality. It neutralizes moral indignation, sponsors playfulness."³⁶ With his final deliberation, the narrator envisages the reader as a recipient who is open to such camp sensibility. However, it cannot be overlooked that the dialogic dimension of this gesture is enacted within the confines of Walser's "Bleistiftgebiet", i.e. the private domain of his pencil. For the Walser of the Berne years, the communicative function of literature was on the verge of collapse.

¹ For a discussion of Walser's poetics of smallness see Anne Fuchs, 'Why Smallness Matters: The Problem of Attention in Franz Kafka's and Robert Walser's Short Prose'. In: Ritchie Robertson and Manfred Engel (eds), *Kafka und die kleine Prosa der Moderne/ Franz Kafka and Short Modernist Prose* [Oxford Kafka Studies 1] Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, pp. 167-81. On the history of the small form in German literature see Günter Oesterle,

“Unter dem Strich”: Skizze einer Kulturpoetik des Feuilletons’, in Jürgen Barkhoff, Gilbert Carr et al. (eds), *Das schwierige neunzehnte Jahrhundert. Germanistische Tagung zum 65. Geburtstag von Eda Sagarra im August 1998* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000), pp. 230-250; Andreas Huyssen, ‘Modernist Miniatures: Literary Snapshots of Urban Spaces’, *PMLA* 122/1 (2007): 27-42; see also Dirk Göttsche, *Kleine Prosa in Moderne und Gegenwart*, Münster: Aschendorff, 2006; Dirk Göttsche, ‘Epistemology, Poetics and Time in Modernist Short Prose around 1900,’ in Anne Fuchs and J.J. Long (eds), *Time in German Literature and Culture, 1900 – 2015: between Acceleration and Slowness* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Palgrave, 2015), forthcoming.

² Robert Walser, *Sämtliche Werke in Einzelausgaben*, ed. Jochen Greven (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986), vol. 20: p. 427 and p. 428. Henceforth cited as SW followed by volume number and page reference.

³ The microscripts have been edited by Bernhard Echte and Werner Morlang in six volumes under the title *Aus dem Bleistiftgebiet* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1985-2000). On the nature of these manuscripts and the history of editing see Bernhard Echte and Werner Morlang, ‘Editorischer Bericht’, in *Aus dem Bleistiftgebiet*, vol. 6 ‘Mikrogramme 1925/33’ (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000), pp. 701-11. Also see their ‘Nachwort’ in the same volume, pp. 568-84.

⁴ Werner Morlang and Bernhard Echte, ‘Editorische Vorbemerkung,’ Robert Walser, *Aus dem Bleistiftgebiet*, vol. 3 “Räuber”-Roman – “Felix”-Szenen (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986): pp. 5-8. I will henceforth cite this edition of the *Räuber*-Roman in the main text as R followed by the page reference.

⁵ Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, translated by Dana Polan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).

⁶ Martin Jürgens, “Das man ihn von nun an kenne und grüße.” Zu Robert Walsers *Räuber*-Roman’, in M. Jürgens, *Seine Kunst zu zögern. Elf Versuche zu Robert Walser* (Münster: Oktober Verlag, 2006), pp. 79-90 (here: p. 79 and p. 80).

⁷ Samuel Frederick, ‘Stealing the Story: Robert Walser’s *Robber*-Novel’, in *Digressions in European Literature. From Cervantes to Sebald*, eds. Alexis Grohmann and Caragh Wells (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 130-42 (here: p. 131)

⁸ Peter Utz, *Tanz auf den Rändern. Robert Walsers “Jetztzeitstil”* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1999), pp. 408-423.

⁹ Christoph Bungartz, *Zurückweichend vorwärtsschreiten. Die Ironie in Robert Walsers Berner Prosa* (Frankfurt am Main, Berne, New York: Peter Lang, 1988), p. 55. See also Thomas Bürgi-

Michaud, *Robert Walsers mühseligkeitsüberschüttetes Kunststück* (Frankfurt am Main, Berne: Peter Lang, 1996), p. 139 and p. 168.

¹⁰ Susan Sontag, 'Notes on "Camp",' in *Against Interpretation and Other Essays* (New York: Delta Book, 1966), pp. 275-92 (here: p. 279 and p. 287).

¹¹ Robert Walser, *The Robber*, translated by Susan Bernofsky (Lincoln, London: University of Nebraska Press, 2000). Henceforth cited in the text as TR. Occasionally I provide my own translations where I deem a more literal translation necessary.

¹² Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, New York: Random House, 1984.

¹³ For a comprehensive survey of the sociology of deviance see Davie Downes and Paul Rock, *Understanding Deviance* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 6th ed. 2011).

¹⁴ The Robber commits one of his greatest offences after the murder of Walter Rathenau: "und was tat da der wundervolle, seltsame Fötzel, er klatschte in die Hände, anstatt daß er vor Schreck und Trauer umgesunken wäre bei solch niederschmetternden Benachrichtigung" (R 21; and what did this marvellous, weird scoundrel do now? He clapped his hands, when he ought to have sunk to the ground in horror and grief at this shattering announcement, TR 11). Here the expected display of public piety is overturned in favor of a carnivalesque celebration of death as a leveller of social differences. Later on the Robber exclaims: "Herrlich dieser Abschluß einer Karriere!" (wonderful, this ending of a great career!). On Walser's preoccupation with Rathenau see the prose piece 'Zwei Männer,' in which he contrasts his own modest background and youth with the privileged upbringing of Walter Rathenau. The piece foregrounds the vast gap in financial and social capital between the two figures. See: 'Zwei Männer,' in *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 16, pp. 194-204.

¹⁵ These include "Peruaner" (Peruvian), "Schafskopf" (simpleton) "Löl" (loser, moron), "Lümmel" (scoundrel), "Abgetaner" (down-and-out), "Trappi" (twit) or "Fötzel" (crook).

¹⁶ Malcolm Pender, 'A Writer's Relationship to Society: Robert Walser's *Räuber*-Roman'. *Modern Language Review* 78 (1983): 103-12 (here: p. 104).

¹⁷ On the split between Erzähler and Räuber see Martin Jürgens, "...Dass man ihn von nun an kenne und grüße", pp. 81-86.

¹⁸ Cit. in Robert Matz, *Defending Literature in Early Modern England: Renaissance Literary Theory in Social Context* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), p. 2.

¹⁹ On pleasure in Walser see Lucia Ruprecht, 'Pleasure and Affinity in W.G. Sebald and Robert Walser,' *German Life & Letters* 62/3 (2009): 311-26.

²⁰ Samuel Frederick, 'Stealing the Story: Robert Walser's *Robber*-Novel,' p. 136.

²¹ Pierre Bourdieu, 'The Forms of Capital', in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. J. Richardson (New York, Greenwood, 1986), pp. 241-58.

²² In other prose pieces Walser interweaves laconic plots summaries of various plays with the narrator's running commentary about the theatrical costume and behavior of Schiller's characters: for example, in 'Schiller I', he wonders whether Ferdinand was perhaps a bit too proud of his "eleganten Degen" (elegant sword) while his Karl was dragging along "ein irgendwo vom Boden aufgehobenes, eventuell in einer Althandlung erstandenes mittelalterliches Schwert, das ihn seines Gewichts wegen hie und da seufzen machte" (a medieval sword that made him sigh now and then because of its weight and that he had either picked up somewhere from the floor or perhaps purchased in a second-hand shop, GS 20: 328).

²³ Besides Schiller's *Die Räuber*, *Wilhelm Tell* is the subject of a number of parodic prose pieces which subvert the Swiss national myth. On this issue see Valerie Heffernan, *Provocation from the Periphery. Robert Walser Re-Examined* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2007, pp. 43-51. See also Monika Lemmel, 'Angelesen? – Robert Walser's Schiller-Texte,' in Anna Fattori, Margit Gigerl (eds), *Bildersprache – Klangfiguren. Spielformen der Intermedialität bei Robert Walser* (Munich: Fink, 2008), pp. 193-200.

²⁴ A reproduction can be found in *Die Brüder Karl und Robert Walser. Maler und Dichter*, eds. Bernhard Echte and Andreas Maier (Stäfa: Rothenhäusler Verlag 1990), p. 44.

²⁵ On Walser's play with trivial literature see Annette Fuchs, *Dramaturgie des Narrentums*, pp. 103-132; Andrea Hübner, "'Das Märchen ja sagt'" – Märchen und Trivialliteratur im Werk von Robert Walser,' in Dieter Borchmeyer (ed.), *Robert Walser und die moderne Poetik* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1999), pp. 167-86.

²⁶ According to Gilles Deleuze, Sacher-Masoch was the first novelist to make suspense an essential ingredient of romantic fiction precisely because masochism requires the postponement of pleasure. See Gilles Deleuze, *Coldness and Cruelty* (New York: Zone Books, 1991), pp. 33-35.

²⁷ Sigmund Freud, 'Fetischismus,' in *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. Anna Freud et al. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1999), vol. 13: pp. 311-17 (here: p. 313).

²⁸ Sigmund Freud, 'Ein Kind wird geschlagen', in *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. Anna Freud (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1999) vol. 12: pp. 195-226 (here: p. 218-20).

²⁹ Freud, 'Das ökonomische Problem des Masochismus', in *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. Anna Freud (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1999) vol. 13: pp. 369-383.

³⁰ Freud, *ibid.*, p. 375.

³¹ Gilles Deleuze, *Masochism: Coldness and Cruelty*, translated by Jean Mc Neil (New York: Zone Books, 1987).

³² Torkild Thamen and Louise Wallenberg, 'Buggering Freud and Deleuze: toward a queer theory of masochism'. *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture* 2 (2010) See: <<http://www.aestheticsandculture.net/index.php/jac/article/view/4642/5118>>. Accessed: 28 March 2012.

³³ See Ernst Osterkamp, 'Commis, Poet, Räuber. Eigengesetzlichkeit und Selbstaufgabe bei Robert Walser,' in *Robert Walser*, eds Klaus-Michael Hinz and Thomas Horst (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991), pp. 217-239 (here: p. 235).

³⁴ Peter Utz, *Tanz auf den Rändern*, p. 419.

³⁵ Susan Sontag, Notes on "Camp," p. 286.

³⁶ Susan Sontag, Notes on "Camp," p. 290.